25

EXHIBIT

1

F

1	APPEARANCES:	(Continued)	
2	For the Defend	BY: MR. MORGAN CHURMA	
3		333 West Wacker Drive, Suite 450 Chicago, Illinois 60606	
4		(312) 726-6000 Mchurma@scharfbanks.com	
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22	Court Poportor	·	
23	Court Reporter	: Brenda S. Tannehill, CSR, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter 219 South Dearborn Street, Suite 1928	
24		Chicago, Illinois 60604	
25		(312) 554-8931 brenda_tannehill@ilnd.uscourts.gov	

(Proceedings held remotely, via telephone:)

THE COURT: Good morning. This is Judge Wood. I think we're ready to get started, so I'll have my courtroom deputy call the case, and then we'll get appearances. And we'll start with defense counsel when we get appearances.

David, go ahead and call the case.

THE CLERK: 18 C 8243, Hudson versus Foxx, et al., for status.

MR. CHURMA: Morgan Churma on behalf of defendants.

THE COURT: Thank you.

And do we have the plaintiff on the line?

MR. HUDSON: Good morning, Judge. This is Brandon Hudson.

THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Hudson.

Okay. So I set the status to find out what was going on with the parties' settlement efforts because I did not receive dismissal papers as I had anticipated; and then yesterday, in advance of the hearing, there was a filing by defense counsel to have the case dismissed pursuant to a settlement agreement or, alternatively, on the ground that was raised prior to all of our settlement discussions.

I did take a look at the motion to dismiss the case with prejudice that was filed by the defendants which attaches what appears to be a letter agreement to resolve the case.

That appears to be signed by Mr. Hudson. And then there's

also a stipulation attached which has typed signatures on both lines.

So I wasn't sure what the current status is. It would appear that the parties have agreed to settlement terms and the case is ripe to be dismissed, but nothing has been filed.

So since it's defendant's motion, let me hear from Mr. Churma what their understanding is and why it is that they've filed this motion, and then I'll get a response from Mr. Hudson.

MR. CHURMA: Thank you, Your Honor.

Yeah. So, I mean, we entered into the settlement agreement by the Court's deadline, and then we followed up with Mr. Hudson via email asking him to file the stipulation of dismissal which was attached to the settlement letter. And that's where the electronic signatures were on that as well so he could just simply file it without having any more back and forth.

We asked him whether or not he intended to file it, and he never responded to that. And we again followed up with him after this Court set the status hearing asking if he intended to file it or if he would prefer that we file it. And since we didn't hear back from him again, we wanted to file this motion with the Court in advance of today's hearing to update the Court on the status of everything.

THE COURT: So Mr. Foxx -- I'm sorry. Not Mr. Foxx.

Mr. Hudson, what is going on with the agreement? It looks like you signed off on the letter agreement. Is there any reason that I shouldn't dismiss the case pursuant to that agreement at this point?

MR. HUDSON: Judge, I signed it on June 7th. I think that's over a month ago now. The only, I guess, hesitancy was I never wanted to represent myself in this matter, so I reached out to Chicago Lawyers Committee For Civil Rights to see if I can get someone possibly appointed through the Settlement Assistance Program. They informed me to ask Your Honor and Counsel if someone could do that.

It seems that opposing counsel has filed it. I signed it. I think I'm kind of without any options at this point unless Your Honor is inclined to have someone else look at it. But it is signed and it's filed, so it's there in the record.

THE COURT: Mr. Hudson, is there some particular concern that you have about the terms that's giving you pause?

MR. HUDSON: Well, it's just I don't -- with legal matters, I never represent myself. I haven't been in a predicament where counsel that I've retained has left the file in settlement. So that's the only pause that I have.

I don't usually review documents that relate to me and then file them on my own behalf, so that is why I did not

do so in this case. I've never done so, and I don't want to create a practice of doing that, especially at this level of court, in federal court at the district level.

So that's the only pause that -- or delay on my behalf. But I did sign it on June 7th, again, I guess, without counsel and without opposing counsel agreeing to the Settlement Assistance Program or settlement counsel to help me review it.

THE COURT: So Mr. Hudson, the difficulty with your request at this point is that it would appear from the signature accepting the agreement as of June 7th that there was a meeting of the minds here, that there was consideration for the agreement; both sides were offering something and giving up something.

And so absent some reason for me to find that perhaps this decision was coerced in some way, that it wasn't actually an agreement entered into through your consent but somehow was forced, unless the defense agrees to allow the additional time, it's not clear to me that there's any basis not to enforce the settlement.

I'll also note it was signed off on on June 7th. If you wanted to have settlement assistance provided through the court, I would have expected a motion or a request to be made along those lines sooner. It's over a month after the letter agreement was signed. It looks like it was signed relatively

soon after it was sent. So there is the concern that to the extent you had second thoughts about this agreement that you weren't diligent in following up on them.

So again, I think the real issue here is that the terms of the agreement are clearly stated. It's a signed, written agreement. Appears to be adequate consideration, a meeting of the minds.

I know you were represented by counsel for a part of the settlement agreement -- settlement discussions but not all. I participated in some of the later settlement discussions with the parties and believed that everybody sort of understood what was going on. I don't think there was any undue pressure or any concern with coercion or the voluntariness of the decision on either side.

So again, unless Mr. Churma tells me that the defendants are willing to, just for everyone's peace of mind, allow additional time for Mr. Hudson to have another attorney get involved, I'd be hard pressed to see a reason not to enforce the settlement.

Mr. Churma.

MR. CHURMA: Yeah. Thank you, Your Honor.

I mean, it's time for this case to come to an end. The defendants aren't interested in allowing any additional time.

As the Court stated, Mr. Hudson had counsel

throughout almost the entirety of the settlement conversations. The Court participated in that as well.

This letter agreement is substantially identical to the one that was provided to Mr. Hudson's former counsel, and my understanding is that she discussed it with him. And we all discussed this with Your Honor. And so I think the time for this case to be dismissed is now.

THE COURT: Mr. Hudson, I'll give you one last opportunity if you have any cause why I shouldn't proceed with dismissing the case with prejudice at this point.

MR. HUDSON: Judge, I would agree with you, I haven't filed anything with the Court to bring this request to your attention, but my request to at all times, like, not be underrepresented or -- I never wanted to be pro se in this matter, so I think I've made that clear to opposing counsel and to Your Honor.

As far as the diligence that Your Honor mentioned, I have been in touch, like I said, with the civil rights Chicago lawyers, civil rights group, and a private law firm that was looking into assisting me, but they have not been able to make a decision before today's date. So I don't want to hold things up if Your Honor thinks that this is a fair outcome based on the time that has passed. And, you know, it is signed.

I just think with my counsel leaving during

settlement and some of the requests that occurred with the back and forth may present an issue, and maybe it won't. I'm not sure.

THE COURT: In asking for other attorneys to step in and represent you, did you inform them that there was a signed agreement to dismiss the case?

MR. HUDSON: I did. I also informed them of the circumstances under which I signed it. So yeah, I did. To answer your question, I did inform them of that.

THE COURT: Okay. So again, given that there is a motion essentially to enforce the settlement, I have to approach it looking at contract principles here.

We have offer. We have acceptance. We have sufficiently definite terms that are stated in writing. There appears to be adequate consideration.

I think the only argument here for not treating this as a binding settlement agreement and enforcing its terms would be the suggestion by Mr. Hudson that perhaps he wasn't adequately advised or informed or felt some pressure to sign the agreement as a result of losing his counsel over the course of the settlement discussions.

In considering whether that might provide a reason not to enforce an otherwise inherently enforceable agreement, I think, one, the counsel that was in the case was involved for a portion of the settlement discussions. I actually kept

her in, and she continued to provide advice a little bit longer than perhaps she desired to.

I then mediated some further settlement discussions, and based on my observation, I think the options for the parties were clearly discussed and laid out the risks. The benefits to each side were clearly laid out. There was time provided for each side to think about whether to agree to these terms.

There was an opportunity, if the parties didn't agree within a certain time period, to then have a further status date with the Court. So there wasn't a sense of you have to decide immediately or else. It was see if you decide, and if not, we'll have another discussion on how things are going to go from here. So I don't think there was any pressure in that sense.

It seems that the correspondence from defense counsel to Mr. Hudson was not unprofessional or abusive in any way with respect to asking that he sign the letter agreement.

I also, of course, have to take into account whether there's any reason to think that Mr. Hudson didn't understand the terms or, you know, his ability to make these decisions.

And certainly, I know Mr. Hudson to be an attorney himself. That's probably one of the reasons why he really wanted to have an attorney advise him, because I think most of us who have practiced or practice appreciate the value of

having somebody other than yourself provide advice. But that said, given Mr. Hudson's background and given my interactions with him in connection with this case when he was represented and after he was no longer represented, I believe he understood the procedural posture of the case, the pros and cons of settlement, what the effect of the settlement would be.

So while getting another opinion may have given or would give Mr. Hudson additional peace of mind and maybe belts and suspenders from his perspective to make sure that he's doing the right thing, that's not the standard that I need to apply in considering whether to enforce the settlement.

And the fact that Mr. Hudson didn't have counsel by itself isn't dispositive here because, of course, there is no right to counsel in a civil case even for people who aren't schooled in the law themselves or haven't had the benefit of speaking with attorneys at any point in the process.

So for all of those reasons, looking at the written agreement in front of me and the fact that there's no dispute that this is Mr. Hudson's signature on it, it's signed by Ms. Marmor on behalf of the defendants, I am going to enforce the settlement and proceed to dismiss the lawsuit with prejudice and find that the settlement agreement that's been provided reflects the material terms to which the parties have agreed.

Mr. Hudson, I appreciate that you may still have some lingering doubts in your mind. I have to look at the documentation that's in front of me and apply the law to it.

So I will say, as I have had said to the parties before, I think it's clear that this is a situation that has caused a bit of disruption and angst on both sides, and so perhaps all for the best at this point for the parties to be able to get closure.

With that, the case will be closed.

Is there anything further from the defendants on this matter, Mr. Churma?

MR. CHURMA: No. Thank you, Your Honor. I think that will be sufficient.

THE COURT: Mr. Hudson?

MR. HUDSON: I find myself in an interesting spot,

Judge, because I'm not represented, and it is a settlement.

So, you know, as I said, there are attorneys looking at this,

and I don't know for the record if I need to preserve any

rights to allow them to get back to me.

So as I've signed it, I don't know if I need to have an objection on the record in time in case the attorneys want to come in and try to set it aside under some theories that they evaluate. But like I said, it being me and I'm the party, to kind of speak out of both sides of my mouth is really kind of silly.

THE COURT: Let me ask one further question, actually, because I do want to make sure the procedural issues are all addressed.

Mr. Churma, did you let Mr. Hudson know in advance of the hearing today or in advance of filing it yesterday that you were going to be asking for enforcement of the settlement?

MR. CHURMA: No, Your Honor. We asked them -- we sent multiple emails to him to see if he would follow the terms of the settlement and file the dismissal papers, and we never heard back from him.

So our position, we wanted to file the motion to dismiss to enforce the settlement agreement. The terms are already clear. I don't think there was anything new, but we didn't reach out to him beforehand since we hadn't been able to get in touch with him previously.

THE COURT: Understood.

So here's one modification I'm going to make to my ruling, probably much to the chagrin of Mr. Churma, but I think given the fact that there was just a 24-hour notice that the motion was going to be heard today, it's probably the appropriate thing to do, given that under normal circumstances, I do require a three-day notice for any hearings.

I am going to dismiss the case today without prejudice. I'm going to allow seven days, so exactly one

week, until July 30th.

If there is some reason that has not been articulated today, Mr. Hudson, that you have for me to set aside basically the order that the case should be dismissed and take some other action, you will need to file a motion to reinstate the case, to reconsider the order allowing the enforcement of the settlement. So essentially, it would be a filing asking to vacate the order enforcing the settlement and seeking reconsideration of that decision within seven days.

If there's no filing, the case will be dismissed with prejudice without anything further.

So I'll give you an opportunity to give some thought to whether there's a basis here, to see if you hear back from any of these counsel that you've spoken to.

Again, I think seven days under other circumstances is a shorter period of time, but given that you've had a few weeks since you signed off on this agreement, I think that should be a generous amount of time for you to follow up and to see if there is any reason that I shouldn't proceed.

As you're having those discussions, of course, keep in mind what the procedural posture of this case was at the time that you entered into the agreement because if I don't enforce the settlement and -- well, if I vacate the order that the settlement's being enforced due to some reason for reconsideration that's presented, then I imagine that the

defense position is going to revert back to the objections about the filing of the amended complaint and whether the prior motion for voluntary dismissal should be with or without prejudice. It doesn't get the case moving forward again. You're still at the stage of having had your most recent complaint dismissed. So it's not necessarily that the litigation is moving forward and now you're going to get discovery, et cetera. And that's just something that you should keep it mind.

Okay. Any questions about that approach, Mr. Hudson?

MR. HUDSON: No, Judge. I'm grateful for the week.

I have been diligent since the agreement issued in asking. I've been following up with the attorneys, so I think a week is appropriate here. So thank you for that.

Is there any reason that Your Honor could see for not asking for an attorney through the Settlement Assistance

Program just to review this, or is that not appropriate at this time?

THE COURT: The difficulty, Mr. Hudson, is, again, there would appear to be a valid contract that's in place here. Illinois contract law principles would apply to whether the settlement is valid and enforceable.

Without some indication that one of the elements for a binding agreement is lacking or that there's some defense to enforcing the settlement that needs to be explored, whether

it's coercion or duress or whatever the typical defenses are that sometimes people raise to enforcement of a settlement, I can't find that there is grounds to go through the Settlement Assistance Program.

It's a limited resource that, you know, there are other plaintiffs who don't have a settlement agreement that appears to be valid and enforceable who need to make use of those resources. So it's not clear to me that there would be an appropriate basis for me to go to that program when it does appear that a settlement has already been reached here.

So that's, I think, the answer.

Any other questions, Mr. Hudson?

MR. HUDSON: No, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: So here's what the order will read.

Let me see if there's any questions from the defense.

MR. CHURMA: We don't have any questions. I don't have any questions, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So here's what the order will read because normally, when there's a motion to enforce a settlement, it's a case-dispositive motion, it is in and of itself an order that would be appealable, assuming that it was objected to.

It's not clear to me exactly whether Mr. Hudson has objected to the motion at this point or simply wants to reserve the ability to do so. So --

1 MR. HUDSON: Judge.

THE COURT: Yes. Go ahead, Mr. Hudson.

MR. HUDSON: I wasn't sure, based on the notice, if you were going to allow the motion, but if the motion is allowed, I would like to preserve rights as it relates to the motion.

I know the settlement contemplates waiving appellate rights for that, but with the motion being filed less than 24 hours in the notice period, if we're going to allow it to go forward, then I would just object for the record to preserve those rights.

THE COURT: Okay. So here's what I think is the cleanest procedural way to address this. The order will reflect my initial, I'll say, preliminary ruling that this appears to be a valid and enforceable settlement agreement and there's no basis to set it aside.

Accordingly, defendant will have seven days to show cause. So the case will be dismissed initially -- well, what do I want to say here?

I'm going to say that the plaintiff will have seven days to show cause in writing why the case should not be dismissed with prejudice. And there would be a separate Rule 58 judgment entered at that time to indicate that it's pursuant to the motion rather than just a voluntary dismissal.

If within the next seven-day period there is a motion

filed explaining why the settlement shouldn't be enforced and the case dismissed with prejudice, then I will take up that motion as I indicated. If nothing is filed, the case will be dismissed with prejudice.

So I'm going to phrase this as a show cause type position where there appears to be a solid basis for enforcement of the settlement and dismissal with prejudice.

Your seven-day period is to show cause why the case should not be dismissed with prejudice.

Okay, Mr. Hudson?

MR. HUDSON: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm not going to set a further status date, so the onus here will be on the parties.

If there is a party that wants to prevent the entry of a dismissal with prejudice seven days from now, that party will need to request that relief through a motion asking for whatever the relief is and a hearing.

I think that's appropriate, given the fact that, apparently, the parties did have doubts about how things should proceed and hadn't reached out. Even after I set the status date for today, it seems that the parties didn't -- I know initially, the defendants eventually took the initiative to file something, but I am concerned that there wasn't anything from the plaintiff's side, given that Mr. Hudson obviously knew that he had entered into this agreement, he

obviously wanted relief from his obligations but as I understand it from the email that was sent to my chambers earlier today was not even necessarily planning to appear for the hearing to let me know what was going on.

So to make sure that this isn't a situation where silence keeps us in a holding pattern, I'm going to put the

8 without prejudice to actually take an affirmative step to do
9 so. And if you don't, then it will be dismissed with
10 prejudice on the 30th.

onus on any party that wants to object to the dismissal

MR. CHURMA: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Churma. Thank you, Mr. Hudson.

MR. CHURMA: Have a good day.

(Proceedings adjourned at 10:55 a.m.)

1	CERTIFICATE			
2				
3				
4	I, Brenda S. Tannehill, certify that the foregoing is			
5	a complete, true, and accurate transcript from the record of			
6	proceedings on July 23, 2021, before the HON. ANDREA R. WOOD			
7	in the above-entitled matter.			
8				
9				
10	/s/Brenda S. Tannehill, CSR, RPR, CRR 10/13/2021			
11	Official Court Reporter United States District Court			
12	Northern District of Illinois Eastern Division			
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				